Info-Hams Digest   Mon, 6 Jun 94   Volume 94 : Issue 635

Today's Topics:
                            "73's"
                        FCC computers up!
                      Mac Ham Radio Software
                  Macintosh Hypercard Test Stacks
                      Operating in Mexico
                    PLANS FOR BUILDING A QUAD..

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 6 Jun 94 14:40:11 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!hp-pcd!hpspkla!dubner@hplabs.hpl.hp.com
Subject: "73's"
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

This looks like a good chance to dredge up a piece I wrote a few years
back that's only peripherally related to "73's". I've been waiting for
a chance to reuse it <g>.

                            73s

     Yes, I know that the term "73" (best regards) doesn't need an "s"
suffix, but in this case I'm referring to multiple instances of 73 --
hence "73s".

     Have you ever noticed the ingenious excuses that a ham will use
when he wants to terminate a QSO. Rather than hurt the QSOee's feelings

by saying he'd rather read yesterday's newspaper than continue the QSO
any longer, a ham will find some "crisis" needing his attention. Even on
packet among locals, this B.S. keeps on flowing! Here are some genuine,
over-the-air reasons for signing off. [The comments in the square
brackets are mine.]

WELL GOT THE CALL FROM MY WIFE AS SHE NEEDS HELP WILL TALK TO YOU
LATER.... TAKE CARE   73'S YOU DISCONNECT...
[Yeah, sure! When was the last time he helped the YF? Do you really
believe he'd quit playing radios just to help the YF?]

Well, Chuck, I have coffee brewed upstairs and the xyl is finally up for
all day.
[It took some strong coffee, but he finally woke the XYL. Now he'd
better QRT before she finds him playing radios.]

Well Joe, I think I better let you go.
[Right. I'm unable to type DISCONNECT myself until you turn CONPERM
OFF.]

The wife just called for dinner, so I'd better not be late.
[It wouldn't hurt for you to miss this meal -- you're already as big as
a house.]

     You are invited to add to the list. I'd continue it, but it's time
for me to take the dog to his therapist. C'mon Spuds.

73,
Joe, K7JD
Hayden Lake, Idaho
dubner@spk.hp.com

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 12:19:41 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!news.cac.psu.edu!
news.pop.psu.edu!ra!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: FCC computers up!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <peterl.770887074@hood> peterl@hood.uucp (Peter Lee) writes:
>
> [some stuff deleted]
>
> I finally received my license after about 10-12 weeks of waiting ...
>
> [more stuff deleted]
>

```
> Once again, the FCC is showing just how inefficient government agencies
> can be, and I think folks who take the time to get into ham radio are
> being served a tremendous disservice.
>
```

   Which raises an interesting question... How long does it take to get
any kind of license for those services regulated under the Private Radio
Bureau, or are common carriers? For example, how long does it take to get
a license for GMRS or business band?

   I can *somewhat* understand the FCC not giving amateur licensing top
priority. After all, it's just a hobby. (Hey, no flames please.)
Nevertheless, if the federal government is going to require us to have a
license to operate, then it is incumbent upon the FCC to be timely when
processing paperwork, and issuing licenses.

   When I was first licensed back in 1986, it took about four to five
weeks to get your novice ticket. That was not an unreasonable amount of
time.

   I was talking to a guy in my neighborhood last night who said that once
the FCC gets it's new computer system running, the plan is to process the
whole lot of technician class applicants. Is this true? Does the FCC
have any game plan for clearing the bottleneck?

-Dave
--
David Drumheller, KA3QBQ   phone: (202) 767-3524
Acoustics Division, Code 7140   fax: (202) 404-7732
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, DC 20375-5350   e-mail: drumhell@claudette.nrl.navy.mil

----

Date: 6 Jun 1994 07:56:03 -0400
From: newstf01.cr1.aol.com!search01.news.aol.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Mac Ham Radio Software
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2so3u6$bgr@search01.news.aol.com>, jeffr100@aol.com (Jeff
R100) writes:

Jeff.... there is quite a bit of Macintosh Ham Radio software out
there. I am almost ready to send out the "new" list to the nets
again... I've busy around here with too many Public Service events!

The new list should be ready to hit the newsgroups today.

... and Jeff... if you are on AOL... try using keyword "ham radio"
and check out the Mac Ham Radio Software Library!

73 for now.... c u on the shortwaves
Terry Stader - KA8SCP
America Online Ham Radio Club Host
Macintosh Amateur Radio Software List Maintainer
Internet: tstader@aol.com (e-mail) or
          p00489@psilink.com (binaries/files >28K)
KA8SCP@WA1PHY.#EMA.MA.USA.NOAM
ka8scp@ka8scp.ampr.org [44.56.4.82] Mac
                       [44.56.4.120] DOS Clone

Date: 6 Jun 94 12:23:05 GMT
From: newstf01.cr1.aol.com!search01.news.aol.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Macintosh Hypercard Test Stacks
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Date: Mon, 06 Jun 1994 02:50:37 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.duke.edu!eff!neoucom.edu!
news.ysu.edu!malgudi.oar.net!witch!doghouse!jsalemi@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Operating in Mexico
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun4.114102.672@atlas.tntech.edu>, JEFF M. GOLD (jmg@tntech.edu)
writes:
>Does anyone know if you need to get a license or do paperwork to
>operate in Mexico?
>

Yes; there was an article in a recent magazine (Radio Fun, January or
February, if memory serves) about what's involved. You can also
contact the ARRL's Reciprocol Licensing Dept. for info and the forms.

73...joe

Joe Salemi, KR4CZ   Internet: jsalemi@doghouse.win.net
Compuserve: 72631,23   FidoNet: 1:109/136   MCI Mail: 433-3961

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 07:05:42 +0000
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!pipex!uknet!demon!mos.com!aperez@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: PLANS FOR BUILDING A QUAD..
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

        Hello.. My name is Anibal,I'm planning on building an antenna
and my next antenna I would like to have a Quad antenna....I've heard
they are good antennas and have good Gain...If anybody out there could
be kind enough that might have some diagrams on how to build one I'll be
in a great debt ....tnx........
                Anibal Perez (ka4kai)
                aperez@mos.com

Date: 6 Jun 1994 06:33:07 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!news.uh.edu!uuneo.neosoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-
for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2st6jd$ej5@ccnet.ccnet.com>, <rogjdCqxv79.B00@netcom.com>,
<2ste09$hi4@ccnet.ccnet.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <2ste09$hi4@ccnet.ccnet.com>,
Bob Wilkins n6fri <rwilkins@ccnet.com> wrote:

>This does not appear to be a spectrum management issue. By allowing "good"
>operators to use their closed repeater they have functioned on the crud
>-magnet. Most closed groups only want the "fine business" operators or
>they strive for true excellence.

While this is certainly true of some "closed" repeaters, it isn't always the
case. In my case, I participate in a large inter-city linked system with over
100 stations linked. With a system this large, it would be unmanagable without
some control over who uses it and how. Closed doesn't necessarily mean "you
can't talk here"... it just means "ask first".

Our system would be effectively "closed" even if it weren't listed as such.
A closed system is a political mindset of a group of users which cannot be
changed by words on a coordination document.

--
   Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Real Texans don't let the truth get in

jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | the way of a good story."

Date: 6 Jun 1994 06:25:47 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!news.uh.edu!uuneo.neosoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <gregCqts8v.45J@netcom.com>, <2so39e$t29@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<1994Jun5.013218.14136@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <1994Jun5.013218.14136@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:

>This is where the classic frequency coordinator hat and the spectrum
>management hat get tangled. Many coordinating bodies try to wear both
>hats and there is a basic conflict.

You are correct about this. Many coordination organizations do try to wear
both hats. They find out that they are very good at coordination, but very
bad at spectrum management. This is because _coordination_ is a _technical_
field, and _spectrum management_ is a _political_ field.

When coordinating to reduce interference, it's easy to apply the laws of
physics to the situation. When determining who is "more worthy", people
become involved...and people aren't predictable.

>Many people feel that the only correct policy as coordinator is
>"first come, first serve", so whoever first files a non-conflicting
>application to operate a repeater gets the coordination in perpetuity.

...not necessarily in perpetuity...but...

This is the ONLY fair way to do this...assuming you are a _coordinator_.

>However, as spectrum managers, the body has to take into account the
>interests of all of the amateur community, users as well as operators
>of the designated repeater spectrum, in order to maximize the utility
>of the limited public resource to *all* amateurs. This is a dynamic
>role in a growing service.

...and a role best suited for a group of coordination organizations working
together with hams using all modes and frequencies to find the BEST political
solution that everyone can live with. Knowing full well that everyone WON'T
get everything they want.

>It's in this latter role of establishing
>public policy that most coordinating bodies fail to carry out their
>responsibilities.

...but unfortunately, the coordinators are the people most hams EXPECT to do
the job. Nevermind that they don't know HOW to do it...It just wasn't needed
as badly until recently.

What IS needed is for someone at a national level to realize that spectrum
management is political in nature and must be dealt with accordingly. The
ARRL's lame attempts at spectrum management has been to get five people in
a room and decide how best to plan the band for the entire nation...then ram
that down all the coordinators' throats by printing that band plan in the
repeater directory.

I would love for the ARRL to make a really good try at spectrum management, but
to do so will require them to admit that life exists above 30 MHz and west of
the Mississippi river. They also need to realize that the needs are different
in different areas, and a "national" bandplan simply isn't realistic. There
will be differences around the country...and that's OK. I'm not sure the
League is up to the task.

--
    Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Real Texans don't let the truth get in
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | the way of a good story."

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 12:21:35 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!rogjd@decwrl.dec.com
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jun2.135032.15067@cs.brown.edu>, <rogjdCqvLst.KD1@netcom.com>,
<CqyoFA.L5s@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Jeffrey Herman (jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu) wrote:
: In article <rogjdCqvLst.KD1@netcom.com> rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington)
writes:
: >
: >That's a hoot! 3000+ hams! We have more than that within a radius of
: >three miles of my QTH! In fact, we have somewhere on the order of 50,000
: >hams within simplex range of my QTH. Perhaps you simply don't understand
: >the issues here in Southern California.

: What issues? Seems as if you have plenty of people to talk to on simplex.
: Why bother to use a repeater?

: Jeff NH6IL

Jeff, how about giving all of us a break, and if you don't have serious
comments about the topic of the thread, then simply QRT.

73
--

                                    rogjd@netcom.com
                                    Glendale, CA
                                    AB6WR

Date: (null)
From: (null)
<Ham Test Stacks>
 HyperCard stacks containing the entire question pool for each
license class. Can be used for preparation or generating actual
tests. The current releases are: Novice v4.1(new questions eff.
7/1/93), Technician v4.0(new questions effective 7/1/93), General
v2.4, Advanced v2.4, Extra v2.4.
 Available via anonymous FTP from various sites, including
uxc.cso.uiuc.edu (/pub/ham-radio). NOTE: The newest releases of
Novice and Technician stacks are available at uxc.cso.uiuc.edu
(5/6/93) Author is available via Internet: dls@genrad.com
 NOTE: Diana no longer is supporting this software, she no longer has
a Macintosh computer. Diana thanks for your wonderful contribution to
the Amateur Radio community for these stacks!
 System 7 savy with HyperCard 2.1

Diana is no longer maintaining these stacks.... is there anyone in
the Mac community who would like to take this on? I just got a note
today indicating that the General question pool changes on 1 July
1994. I sure would hate to see these valuable tools become
out-of-date.

I'll be glad to support whomever would like to work on this project
with the information on how to gain access to the info required.

73 for now.... c u on the shortwaves
Terry Stader - KA8SCP
America Online Ham Radio Club Host
Macintosh Amateur Radio Software List Maintainer
Internet: tstader@aol.com (e-mail) or
         p00489@psilink.com (binaries/files >28K)

Date: 6 Jun 94 12:53:35 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3!md@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <gregCqts8v.45J@netcom.com>, <2so39e$t29@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<2su9ku$asl@kaiwan.kaiwan.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <2su9ku$asl@kaiwan.kaiwan.com>,
    topolski@kaiwan.com (Robb Topolski KJ6YT) writes:

|> Don't coordinators do this anyway? If "Applicant A" applied for a pair 2
|> months before "Applicant B", yet the second applicant's station location
|> provides better spectrum use and no interference, who should the
|> coordinator give the available frequencies to?

Applicant A should receive a frequency pair which minimizes interference.
If no frequency pair can be found that can do that, s/he should be
denied a pair. "Better spectrum use" should not be a concern. If it
were, then most packet radio and ATV frequencies should be reassigned
for repeater operation, since there are more people using FM voice than
ATV or packet, and clearly spectrum would be utilized better if we
eliminated those protected frequecies.

|> I also think that if "Scrubba" made it a policy that 75% of all repeater
|> coordinations were to be for "open" repeaters, as long as that policy was
|> equally enforced, they'd be safe.

Define an "open" repeater. If you say "a repeater which has no access
restrictions" then you are contradicting the FCC, which has specifically
stated that trustees have the right to say who may and may not use their
repeater.

|> Yes, they might get sued. You might get sued. You might sue me. The
|> real threat of getting sued should not drive decisions. The threat of
|> losing should.

The threat of losing is irrelevent. The only issue is whether or not you
can back up your decision with cash.

MD
--
-- Michael P. Deignan
-- RI Center For Political Incorrectness & Environment Ignorance
-- 'Have you hugged your chainsaw today?'

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 12:27:26 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!rogjd@decwrl.dec.com
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <Cqsn7v.FsI@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <rogjdCqunyu.4rC@netcom.com>,
<CqyMzM.KnI@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject : Re: Reality check (was Re: Ham Radio few problem)

Jeffrey Herman (jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu) wrote:
: In article <rogjdCqunyu.4rC@netcom.com> rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington)
writes:
: >Jeffrey Herman (jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu) wrote:
: >
: >: I knew the Defender of Radio Lawbreakers would eventually surface. You
: >: came to Bly's defense in December when he bragged about operating
: >: without a license, and now in June Bly resurfaces and so do you.
: >
: >Oh, come on, this is silly and asinine. Linking Dana to Bly when what he
: >is really doing is offering a well-reasoned response on the subject of
: >this thread.

: You're new on here so let me fill you in:

: 1. One fellow was bragging about how he was going to place a 5 kW broadcast
: band transmitter on the ham bands and about how he didn't care about the
: FCC rules, etc. - I scolded him - Dana came to his defense.

: 2. Bly bragged about how easy it is to operate in SoCal without a license
: and that he'd done it for years - I scolded him - Dana came to his defense.

: 3. Someone was inviting pirates to use 6 Mc air-to-ground frequencies - I
: argued with him about the danger of that - Dana came to his defense.

: 4. Bly now brags about jamming closed 440 Mc repeaters - I scold him -
: Dana shows up.

: You might want to `read the mail' for a couple of months before you become
: too critical.

```
           : Jeff NH6IL

Sorry Jeff, doesn't hold water.  I don't know anything about what was
said back in December, that is true.  But your characterization of Dana's
comments in this thread is unfair and highly inaccurate.  Very highly
inaccurate.

I would suspect that the same can be said of the earlier comments based
on the distortion of the current comments?

73
--
                                        rogjd@netcom.com
                                        Glendale, CA
                                        AB6WR


------------------------------

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 13:08:07 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3!md@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <rogjdCqvLJD.K4J@netcom.com>, <1994Jun4.165326.8941@cs.brown.edu>,
<2suau8$cvj@kaiwan.kaiwan.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <2suau8$cvj@kaiwan.kaiwan.com>,
     topolski@kaiwan.com (Robb Topolski KJ6YT) writes:

|> Michael, not to pick on you.  I've seen this mis-repeated about a
|> half-dozen times in this thread so I picked yours to reply to.
|>
|> THE F.C.C. DID NOT OUTLAW AND/OR CLOSE "OPEN" REPEATERS.  All they did
|> was reaffirm the right of the licensee to determine who uses the
|> repeaters under his control and callsign.  They cited chapter and verse
|> what Part 97 already said.  Nothing new here.
|>
|> "An open repeater is a repeater that does not limit those who use the
|> repeater to members, affiliates, or other defined group or list of
|> operators."  (source, "KJ6YT's Authoritative and Official Sounding Book of
|> Ham Radio Definitions, Volume 1.)
|>
|> An open repeater's trustee can still keep KW6UNK from using the repeater
|> to read his 60's poetry -- or even at all, if he wishes.  The FCC doesn't
|> care if the licensee considers his repeater "open" or "closed."  The FCC
|> says that the licensee can pick and choose who can and cannot use the
|> repeater.
```

Okay Robb, let's accept your statements here on face value. If I apply
for an "open" repeater coordination, I can turn around and ask every single
amateur who attempts to use the repeater not to use it until I've
personally met you, so I can get to know each of my users personally.
What are you going to do then? I'm still an "open" repeater. I've
simply decided to exercise my FCC-reaffirmed right to determine who
uses the repeaters under my control.

It appears to me that the the whole issue of decoordinating closed
repeaters seems to be an attempt to take that FCC-reaffirmed right
away from repeater trustees.

|> No, but perhaps it should be a criteria. For example, your application
|> for a 3-neighbor system at the county's highest location vs. a 200-member
|> club who wants to put up an open repeater at the same site. Who should
|> be approved for the high-visibility site? The 200-member club's open
|> system. Who should be guided toward better use? The 3-user system.

Well, I would think you should coordinate both on different frequencies
designed to minimize interference. That 3-user system may involve the
three most important disaster communications coordinators in the county.
The 200-user club system may be just another yak-box. Who knows. Are you
going to open a kangaroo court and start trial proceedings with the
assignment of a frequency going to the "winner"? That's what you're
suggesting.

My judgement is if there is only one frequency available, it goes on
a first-come, first-serve basis.

Let's say you coordinate that 200-user "open" club system. Now a group
comes along which wants to put up a system with a link into a statewide
network of repeaters with over 10,000 users. I guess you should
decoordinate the 200 user system, huh? After all, which would be
"better use"? That's what proponents of closed-system decoordination
are saying.

All of these decisions become value judgements, and let your own personal
biases creep into the decision making process. You may think that open
repeaters are great, so whether you're aware of it or not you're instantly
prejudiced against closed systems, even if the closed system serves a
better purpose.

MD
--
-- Michael P. Deignan
-- RI Center For Political Incorrectness & Environment Ignorance

```
-- 'Have you hugged your chainsaw today?'

------------------------------

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 13:22:28 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!jobone!ukma!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!dgg.cr.usgs.gov!
bodoh@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <rogjdCqunyu.4rC@netcom.com>, <CqyMzM.KnI@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<rogjdCqz6Lq.F0z@netcom.com>
Subject : Re: Reality check (was Re: Ham Radio few problem)

|>
|> Sorry Jeff, doesn't hold water.  I don't know anything about what was
|> said back in December, that is true.  But your characterization of Dana's
|> comments in this thread is unfair and highly inaccurate.  Very highly
|> inaccurate.
|>
|> I would suspect that the same can be said of the earlier comments based
|> on the distortion of the current comments?

Please take your damn bickering elsewhere such as policy - or email.  Yes,
I've heard of killfiles, but your traffic is using up disk on the news
server AND the more topics I add to my killfile, the slower my reader runs...

--
++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++
+ Tom Bodoh - Section Manager, Systems Engineering and Management, Hughes STX +
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA  57198      (605) 594-6830      +
+ Internet; bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)   Amateur radio call; N0YGT +
+    "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P
        +
++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

------------------------------

Date: 6 Jun 1994 05:55:52 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!news.uh.edu!uuneo.neosoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-
for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <gregCqts8v.45J@netcom.com>, <2so39e$t29@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<2su9ku$asl@kaiwan.kaiwan.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <2su9ku$asl@kaiwan.kaiwan.com>,
```

Robb Topolski KJ6YT <topolski@kaiwan.com> wrote:

>Don't coordinators do this anyway? If "Applicant A" applied for a pair 2
>months before "Applicant B", yet the second applicant's station location
>provides better spectrum use and no interference, who should the
>coordinator give the available frequencies to?

The guy who applied first.

>Yes, they might get sued. You might get sued. You might sue me. The
>real threat of getting sued should not drive decisions. The threat of
>losing should.

It cost money to defend yourself against even a frivilous (sp?) lawsuit.
These guys are VOLUNTEERS, remember? I'm certainly not going to be responsible
for paying to defend a lawsuit over a stupid HOBBY!

--
   Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Real Texans don't let the truth get in
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | the way of a good story."

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #635
****